

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

277 SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314

TELEPHONE: (703) 836-6400

FACSIMILE: (703) 836-2787

E-MAIL: LMAIL@OLIFF.COM

WWW.OLIFF.COM

November 5, 2004

**U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET**

To: In re the Application of Masaru TAKEDA et al.	
Application No.: 09/716,415	
Filed: November 21, 2000	Group Art Unit: 2142
For: INFORMATION OUTPUT SYSTEM UTILIZING ELECTRONIC MAIL	Docket No.: 107904

Examiner: Hai V. Nguyen Facsimile: (571) 273-3901From: Leana LevinPrepared By: ll Number of Pages Sent (Including cover sheet): 2**Comments:**

Dear Examiner Nguyen:

Enclosed is an agenda for a personal interview to discuss the Office Action mailed September 7, 2004, for the above-identified application.

Please contact me at (314) 621-8383 regarding scheduling a time for the interview to discuss the proposed response. I will be in Virginia November 16 through November 18. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards.

Leana Levin
Registration No. 51,939Sent by: ll

This facsimile is intended only for the use of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and contains confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this facsimile is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by facsimile or telephone, and return the facsimile to us by mail at the above address.



AGENDA FOR PERSONAL INTERVIEW

- Claims 1--21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over a variety of reference.
- The primary references relied upon by the Patent Office were U.S. Patent No. 6,587,219 ("Saito") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,332 ("Weschler").
- There is no motivation to combine those references. Personal interview requested to explain this point and insure a mutual understanding of this position.
- Even if references were combined, the present invention would not have resulted. Personal interview requested to explain this point and insure a mutual understanding of this position.